

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/022,969	Applicant(s) GARVEY, JOSEPH F.	
	Examiner Chih-Ching Chow	Art Unit 2122	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Chih-Ching Chow. (3)_____.

(2) Mr. Antony P. Ng. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 25 February 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 6.

Identification of prior art discussed: Smith US2002/0016639.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Questions asked by the Examiner and the Attorney's answers were listed as following, an amendment of the claims was faxed to the Examiner on February 25, 2005, see attachement.

Q: Is the pre-processor includes a lexer, a glue routine, and a macro invocation parser? If so, it should be amended to the claims.

A: Yes. The attorney has agreed to amend this feature into the claims.

Q: Is this 'pre-processor' doing another layer of parsing which is in addition to the prior art?

A: Yes. This is the main feature of the current invention, see the difference between FIG.2 and FIG.3.

Q: Is the arrow in FIG.3 going back to the Lexer, after the macro has been expanded, correct?

A: Yes. The macro body will go back to the Lexer, however, it will not go through glue routine process again and it will move ahead to the Parser (13) for normal parsing

Q: Is this pre-processor only for Assembly language processing as stated in the After Final Remarks, page 3, 2nd paragraph?

A: Not really, it can be used for any language.